REMARKS

The present application was filed on February 16, 2001 with claims 1 through 23. Claims 1 through 23 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

5 In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure due to an indicated informality. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tateishi (United States Patent Number 5,539,590).

Formal Objections

The disclosure was objected to for not identifying related applications by 10 serial number. The disclosure has been amended to identify related applications by serial number.

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 16

Independent claims 1, 8, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tateisha.

15 Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Tateisha discloses maintaining said voltage level of said control signal from the previous time interval to indicate a second signal state [no change of the floppy status].

Applicants note that Tateisha teaches that, regarding the status signal STS, a "low level (is) indicative of the unloaded state." (Col. 7, lines 54-55.) Consequently, a 20 high level is indicative of a loaded state. As the Examiner notes, a change in the state of the STS signal (either from a low level to a high level, or from a high level to a low level) causes the output of EX1 to transition from a low level to a high level. Following the next transition of clock CK, the new level of the status signal STS will propagate to the output of the flip-flop in recovery controller 21j and the output of EX1 will transition 25 from the high level back to a low level. The transition of the output from EX1 from the high level back to a low level *will occur even if the status signal does not change again.* Thus, a single change of state of the status signal STS will result in *two* voltage changes of the output of EX1; one of the voltage changes occurs when there is no change of the floppy status. The output of EX1, therefore, does not maintain the voltage of a control 30 signal to indicate no change of the floppy status. Independent claim 1 requires maintaining said voltage level of said control signal from the previous time interval to

indicate a second signal state. Independent claim 8 requires detecting a second signal state if said voltage level from the previous time interval is maintained. Independent claim 16 requires a memory element for maintaining a voltage level from a previous time interval.

5   Thus, Tateisha does not disclose or suggest maintaining said voltage level of said control signal from the previous time interval to indicate a second signal state, as required by independent claim 1, does not disclose or suggest detecting a second signal state if said voltage level from the previous time interval is maintained, as required by independent claim 8, and does not disclose or suggest a memory element for maintaining a voltage level from a previous time interval, as require by independent claim 16.

10

Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-23

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tateisha.

Claims 2-7, 9-15, and 17-23 are dependent on claims 1, 8, and 16,
15   respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Tateisha because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 8, and 16 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-23, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

20   If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

25
Date: March 14, 2005   Kevin M. Mason
                                        Attorney for Applicants
                                        Reg. No. 36,597
                                        Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
30   1300 Post Road, Suite 205
                                        Fairfield, CT 06824
                                        (203) 255-6560